



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/817,203	03/27/2001	Masumi Yoshino	205114US2	7892

22850 7590 06/16/2005

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
1940 DUKE STREET  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
----------

BLAIR, DOUGLAS B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/817,203

Applicant(s)

YOSHINO ET AL.

Examiner

Douglas B. Blair

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/23/2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 February 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/9/2005
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. Claims 1-6 and 8-38 are currently pending in this application.

### ***Drawings***

2. The drawings were received on 2/23/2005. These drawings are accepted.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-6 and 8-24 and 27-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,691,159 to Grewal et al..
5. As to claim 1, Grewal teaches an online support method that gives online support to eliminate a problem arising in a device, said online support method comprising the steps of: providing a user of the device with a specific form that enables the user to input and transmit information with regard to the problem (col. 3, lines 32-45); and providing the user of the device with support information, which is prepared in advance for elimination of the problem, prior to the transmission (col. 3, lines 32-45); and obtaining browsing record information, which represents a user's browsing record of the support information, in addition to the information

Art Unit: 2142

input into the specific form (Figure 4, the "Usual Destinations" box in the top right of the browser is a user browsing record.).

6. As to claim 2, Grewal teaches an online support method in accordance with claim 1, wherein the support information is provided in response to each selecting instruction given by the user (col. 3, lines 32-45).

7. As to claim 3, Grewal teaches an online support method in accordance with claim 1, wherein the specific form also asks the user to input information regarding the individual user (col. 3, lines 15-26).

8. As to claim 4, Grewal teaches an online support method in accordance with claim 1, wherein the specific form also asks the user to input information regarding an operation carried out by the user to eliminate the problem (Figure 6).

9. As to claim 5, Grewal teaches an online support method in accordance with claim 1, wherein the specific form asks the user to input information regarding a user's browsing record of the support information provided in advance (Figure 4).

10. As to claim 6, Grewal teaches an online support method in accordance with claim 1, wherein the specific form comprises a first part that asks the user to input specific information which is generally required for analysis of the problem (col. 3, lines 32-45), and a second part that enables the user to input arbitrary information with regarding to the problem (col. 4, lines 17-33).

11. As to claim 8, Grewal teaches an online support method in accordance with claim 6, wherein the information includes first information required to identify the device and second information required to specify a working status of the device (Figures 4 and 6).

Art Unit: 2142

12. As to claim 9, Grewal teaches an online support method in accordance with claim 8, wherein the first information required to identify the device includes a model name of the device (Figure 4).

13. As to claim 10, Grewal teaches an online support method in accordance with claim 8, wherein the second information required to specify the working status of the device identifies an application program activated on the device when the problem arises (Figure 6).

14. As to claim 11, Grewal teaches an online support method in accordance with claim 8, wherein the device comprises a storage unit in which information representing the working status of the device is stored and second information required to specify the working status of the device comprises information that allows an access to the storage unit (Figure 6).

15. As to claim 15, Grewal teaches an online support method in accordance with claim 1, wherein the form is offered to a user without providing a result (col. 3, lines 53-65).

16. As to claim 24, Grewal teaches an online support method in accordance with claim 16, wherein the device carries out either of processing and generation of digital data, and the specific form asks the user to input at least information that is required to specify a result of either of the processing and the generation carried out by the device (Figure 6).

17. As to claims 12-14, 16-23, and 27-35, they feature limitations from claims 1-4 and 6 and are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1-6.

18. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,629,134 to Hayward et al..

19. As to claim 38, Hayward teaches a recording medium in which a program is recorded, wherein said program functions to drive a device and causes a link to an upper-layered online

Art Unit: 2142

support Web page (col. 3, lines 54-64), which does not depend upon a model of the device nor a problem, out of support Web pages that provide a client with support information to eliminate a problem arising in the device, to be shown in at least one of a setting window that allows a user of the device to specify settings of the device and a display window that displays a working status of the device (col. 5, line 58-col. 6, line 57).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

20. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

21. Claims 25-26 and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,691,159 to Grewal et al. in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,119,247 to House et al..

22. As to claim 25 and 36, Grewal teaches the method of claim 6, however Grewal does not explicitly teach image data showing the inputs.

House teaches image data showing the inputs (col. 4, lines 28-44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Grewal regarding online help with the teachings of House regarding image data because displaying the image helps a remote user debug a problem (House, col. 4, lines 28-44).

Art Unit: 2142

23. As to claims 26 and 37, Grewal teaches the method of claim 6, however Grewal does not explicitly teach image data showing the outputs.

House teaches image data showing the outputs (col. 4, lines 28-44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Grewal regarding online help with the teachings of House regarding image data because displaying the image helps a remote user debug a problem (House, col. 4, lines 28-44).

#### ***Response to Arguments***

24. Applicant's arguments filed 2/23/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

25. The applicant argues that Grewal does not teach "obtaining record information which represents a user's browsing record of the support information, in addition to information input into the specific form"; however, Figure 4 shows a list of usual destinations therefore inherently some form of browsing record has been obtained. The claim language does not stipulate that the browsing record was obtained using the form and even if it did the concept of inputting information into a form, including a browsing record, would have been obvious at the time of the invention.

26. The applicant also argues that Grewal does not teach "the specific form comprises a first part that asks the user to input specific information, which it generally requires for analysis of the problem, and a second part that enables the user input arbitrary information with regard to the problem", however, the cited portions show that the first part of the form can be considered the

Art Unit: 2142

links that specify types of problems and the chat room can be considered the second part for inputting specific information. The claim language is not specific as to the format of the form and even if it were the concept of inputting arbitrary information into two parts of a form was completely obvious at the time of the applicant's invention.

27. The applicant finally argues that Hayward does not teach, "a link to an upper-layered online support web page, which does not depend upon a model of the device". Clearly col. 6, line 29-41 of Hayward, as previously cited, shows exactly that.

28. In conclusion, it is the examiner's position that the claims are broad and anticipated by the prior art. The limitations, as currently claimed, represent concepts that were obvious at the time of the applicant's invention. It is suggested that the claims be amended to point out the specific novelties of the applicant's invention.

### ***Conclusion***

29. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,



Art Unit: 2142

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

30. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Douglas B. Blair whose telephone number is 571-272-3893. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5pm Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on 571-272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Douglas Blair

DBB



KAMINI SHAH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER